



SINGLE BENCH

CF 10/2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 76 /2007 [S.B.]

[IN THE MATTER OF PANCHAYAT]

PETITIONER

:- Ramnath S/o Mahesh, aged about 58 years, by caste- Teli, Sarpanch Gram Panchayat Ranpagula, Permanent resident of village- Ranpagula, at present temporary resident of village Bhainjnar Police Station & Tahsil Sarangarh, District Raigarh [C.G.].

2011/07
Presented by Shri. Ramnath Singh
6/11/07
P.R. No.
Presented by Shri.
dated

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :-

- 1] Siyaram S/o Naresh Sahu, aged 44 years,
- 2] Gokul S/o Manbodh, aged 55 years.
- 3] Radhika wife of Bhokodolo.
- 4] Makaram S/o Munu Sahu,
All are resident of village Ranpagula P.S. & Tahsil Sarangarh, District Raigarh [C.G.].
- 5] Hathi Ram S/o Manglu, aged 40 years, R/o village Bhainjnar, P.S. & Tahsil Sarangarh, District Raigarh [C.G.].
- 6] Kamla Bai wife of Santosh, aged 37 years R/o village Ranpagula P.S. & Tahsil Sarangarh, District Raigarh [C.G.].
- 7] The Director, Panchayat and Social Services, Chhattisgarh, Raipur.
- 8] The Collector, Raigarh [C.G.].

RECEIVED-COPY
6/11/07
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (C) No. 76 of 2007

Petitioner

Ramnath

Versus

Respondents

Siyaram and others

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri, J**

Shri M. K. Bhaduri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Sumit Verma, Panel Lawyer for the respondents No. 7 & 8.

ORDER

(Passed on this 13th day of February, 2007)

1. The petitioner has filed this petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, impugning the order dated 20.9.2006 (Annexure P/3), passed by the Director, Panchayat, Chhattisgarh, Raipur in Revenue Appeal No. 87/A-89/05-06, wherein the revision filed by the petitioner was dismissed on the ground that the main dispute is still pending consideration before the Collector.
2. On reading the order sheets (Annexure P/1 and P/2) it appears that the Collector has requisitioned the reports from the Tahsildar as well as from the Forest Officer. At this stage, it appears that the order passed by the Director is perfectly valid and just. It does not call for interference.
3. In view of the above the petition is dismissed, summarily. The petitioner may raise the dispute after final order is passed by the Collector, if so advised.

Thakur

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge